

REMARKS

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed July 2, 2007.

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 112:

The Examiner rejects Claim 12 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Specifically, the Examiner finds that Claim 12 recites the limitation “subpixel rendering input image data that is input asynchronously” in line 5, and “output subpixel ... in a format that at a second clock rate...” in line 6.

The Examiner finds that it is not clear that how clocks are made or used in this asynchronous system.

Applicant respectfully avers that the present amendment to Claim 12 has muted the present rejection. Applicant has removed that language with respect to a second clock rate on the output of image data to a display. Suitable support in the specification is found, for example, at paragraphs 0044 through 0062.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 102:

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3, 5-10 and 14 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,160,535 (hereinafter “Park”).

As to Claim 1 specifically, the Examiner finds that Park discloses a method of subpixel rendering (see Figure 4 (1)) input image data onto a display panel, said panel substantially comprising a repeating grouping (see Figure 3A(P)) of a plurality of primary colored subpixels (see 'pixel regions' at col. 4, lines 42-55), wherein said input image data has a different number of subpixel data sets for each image frame (see col. 3, lines 13-37) than said display panel, the steps of said method comprising:

subpixel rendering input image data (see Figure 4 (Rn, Gn, Bn)) that is input at a first clock rate (see Figure 4 (LINE));

outputting subpixel rendered data (see Figure 4 (Rn', Gn', Bn')) to said display panel at a second clock rate (see Figure 4 (CLK)) wherein dummy data is inserted into the output data.

As to currently amended Claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses the current rejection.

As currently amended, Claim 1 requires that the input image data be formatted for a first subpixel layout (for example, a conventional RGB striped panel) and that the input image data be subpixel rendered in order to output to a display that comprises a second subpixel format based on a different subpixel repeating group than the first subpixel layout – for example, the subpixel repeating groups as shown in Exemplary Repeater Groups in Figure 22 of the present application.

Park, by contrast, does not disclose this subpixel rendering step between a different first and second subpixel format. Park is primarily concerned with rendering input RGB stripe data onto a display of a same RGB stripe subpixel format.

This is because Park, according to Applicant's reading, is concerned with another problem area altogether different from the present application – that of power savings on an improved dot-inversion scheme. (see Abstract, col. 2, lines 10-45).

As Park does not disclose all limitations of Claim 1, Applicant respectfully avers that Claim 1, as currently amended, is allowable in view of Park.

As Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 8-10 depend from allowable Claim 1, Applicant respectfully avers that these Claims are themselves allowable.

As to currently amended Claim 7, Applicant avers that the same argument for Claim 1 as above applies with equal force to currently amended Claim 7.

As Claim 8 depends from allowable Claim 7, Applicant avers that that Claim is itself allowable.

As for currently amended Claim 14, Applicant avers that the same arguments applied to Claims 1 and 7 above apply with equal force to currently amended Claim 14.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 103:

The Examiner rejects Claims 4, 11-13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of US Patent 6,340,970 (hereinafter "Furuhashi").

Specifically, the Examiner finds that Park discloses the methods of Claim 1 and 6 as noted above.

However, the Examiner finds that Park does not teach that first clock rate and second clock rate are different.

The Examiner, however, finds that Furuhashi teaches a LCD control device using different clocks (see Figure 3, DOT CLOCK and $\frac{1}{2}$ FREQUENCY DOT CLOCK).

Thus, the Examiner concludes, it would have been obvious to incorporate two different clocks as in Furuhashi into Park's LCD device.

Applicant respectfully traverses the present rejection.

Applicant notes that Claims 4 and 11 depend from current amended (and allowable) Claim 1 – therefore, Claims 4 and 11 are themselves allowable.

As for currently amended Claim 12, Applicant avers that the same argument as applied to Claim 1 above, applies with equal force as to currently amended Claim 12.

As Claim 13 depends from allowable Claim 12, Applicant avers that Claim 13 is itself allowable.

Claims 15-17:

The Examiner rejects Claims 15-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of US Patent Application Publication 2004/0263528 (hereinafter "Murdoch").

Specifically, the Examiner finds that, as to Claim 15, Park discloses the system of Claim 14.

However, the Examiner finds that Park does not teach a gamut mapping system for remapping the image data.

Murdoch, according to the Examiner, teaches a gamut mapping technique to provide a method for assigning intensity values for all primary colors.

As to Claims 15-17, Applicant respectfully traverses the present rejection.

As with the arguments for currently amended Claim 14 above, Applicant notes that the system of Claim 14 is allowable over Park and that Claims 15-17 depend from allowable Claim 14. As such, Claims 15-17 are themselves allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending Claims are patentable over the cited art of record and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejection and pass this application to allowance.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite the allowance of the claims, the Examiner is invited to contact Stuart P. Kaler at (408) 200-7387.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 2, 2008

By: /Stuart P. Kaler/
Stuart P. Kaler
Reg. No. 35, 913

Attachments to this amendment by separate submission:

Four (4) Annotated Sheets showing changes made to FIGS. 3, 5, 10 and 13.

Four (4) Replacement Sheets including FIGS. 3, 5, 10 and 13 in their amended form.